



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/498,398	02/04/2000	Soren V. Andersen	20184-000100US	8774

7590 06/07/2004

Robert J Bennett
Towsend & Townsend & Crew
Two Embarcadero Center
8th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

ARMSTRONG, ANGELA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2654

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/498,398

Applicant(s)

ANDRSEN ET AL.

Examiner

Angela A. Armstrong

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-21 and 26-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-21, 26-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 20 and 26-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shlomot et al (US Patent No. 5,699,481) in view of Shepard (US Patent No. 5,943,347).

3. Regarding claim 26, Shlomot teaches a timing recovery scheme for packet speech in multiplexing environment of voice data with applications. Shlomot provides for

Manipulating a received sound signal to produce a sound signal, wherein the received sound signal is received from a packet switched network that loses some packets, at Figure 4, col. 3, line 45 to col. 4, line 41;

Receiving a first received frame from the packet-switched network, wherein the first received frame is part of the received sound signal, at Figure 4, col. 3, line 45 to col. 4, line 41 and col. 5, line 45 to col. 6, line 56;

Producing a first signal frame corresponding to the first received frame, at Figure 4, col. 3, line 45 to col. 4, line 41 and col. 5, line 45 to col. 6, line 56;

Wherein the first signal frame is part of the sound signal, at Figure 4, col. 3, line 45 to col. 4, line 41 and col. 5, line 45 to col. 6, line 56;

The second received frame is normally produced contiguously with the first received frame, at Figure 4, col. 3, line 45 to col. 4, line 41 and col. 5, line 45 to col. 6, line 56;

Determining after beginning the first producing step that at least part of the second received frame is currently unavailable for production, at Figure 4, col. 3, line 45 to col. 4, line 41 and col. 5, line 45 to col. 6, line 56;

Shlomot does not specifically teach producing an expanded portion, wherein the first signal frame and the expanded portion are contiguous parts of the sound signal, and the expanded portion that corresponds to a different amount of the received sound signal than either the first or second received frames.

Refer to Shepard who teaches an apparatus and method for error concealment in an audio stream. Specifically, at col. 3, line 35 continuing to col. 5, line 24, Shepard teaches determining that there is a problem with a received packet, and inserts one cycle of a fundamental pitch period with a cross-fade to replace lost or dropped data, such that the cross-fade renders transitions between boundaries of existing, original data and any inserted data much smoother.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify the system of Shlomot to implement cross fading based in part upon a change in network status, as taught by Shepard, for the purpose of rendering transitions between boundaries of existing, original data and any inserted data much smoother, as suggested by Shepard.

Regarding claim 27, 31, 33, 35-37, and 40, Shlomot and Shepard teach everything as claimed in claim 26. Shlomot does not specifically teach the expanded portion is selected from the first signal frame based, at least in part, upon measures of periodicity or that the portions are merged based, at least in part, on overlap-add. Shepard teaches determining that there is a problem with a received packet, and inserts one cycle of a fundamental pitch period with a cross-

Art Unit: 2654

fade to replace lost or dropped data, such that the cross-fade renders transitions between boundaries of existing, original data and any inserted data much smoother.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify the system of Shlomot to implement cross fading based in part upon a change in network status, as taught by Shepard, for the purpose of rendering transitions between boundaries of existing, original data and any inserted data much smoother, as suggested by Shepard.

Regarding claim 28, Shlomot and Shepard teach everything as claimed in claim 26. Additionally, Shlomot teaches determining step comprises determining near the end of production of the first signal frame if the second received frame is currently unavailable for production, Figure 4, col. 3, line 45 to col. 4, line 41.

Regarding claims 29, 30, 32, 45, and 46, Shlomot and Shepard teach everything as claimed in claim 26. Additionally, Shlomot teaches determining after beginning the second producing step that the second received frame is still unavailable for production, at Figure 4, col. 3, line 45 to col. 4, line 41.

Shlomot does not specifically teach producing a second expanded portion, wherein the expanded portion and the second expanded portion are contiguous parts of the sound signal.

Shepard teaches determining that there is a problem with a received packet, and inserts one cycle of a fundamental pitch period with a cross-fade to replace lost or dropped data, such that the cross-fade renders transitions between boundaries of existing, original data and any inserted data much smoother.

Art Unit: 2654

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify the system of Shlomot to implement cross fading based in part upon a change in network status, as taught by Shepard, for the purpose of rendering transitions between boundaries of existing, original data and any inserted data much smoother, as suggested by Shepard.

Regarding claims 20, 34, 38, and 39, Shlomot and Shepard teach everything as claimed in claim 26. Additionally, Shlomot teaches the signal frame corresponds to a plurality of received frames, at col. 3, line 66 to col. 4, line 1.

Regarding claims 41-44 claims 41-44 are similar in scope and content to claims 26-40, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

4. Claims 13-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shlomot in view of Shepard, as applied to claim 26 above, in further view of Kubin et al, "Time Scale Modification of Speech Based on a Non-linear Oscillator Model," IEEE, 1994, page 453-456.

5. Regarding claims 13-19 and 21, Shlomot and Shepard teach everything as claimed in claim 26. Additionally, Shlomot teaches the system manipulates the length of received signal frames by performing time expansion or time compression of one or more signal frames at time varying intervals and with time varying lengths of the expansion or the compression at col. 3, line 67 continuing to col. 5, line 34; time varying lengths dependent upon a signal fitting criteria with respect to signal characteristics at col. 4, lines 55-63; col. 6, line 65 to col. 7, line 4; col. 7, lines 15-20; length manipulation is a fraction of the time between two samples at col. 4, lines 55-

Art Unit: 2654

63; col. 6, line 65 to col. 7, line 4; col. 7, lines 15-20. Shlomot and Shepard do not specifically implement an oscillator model when manipulating the lengths of the signal frames.

Kubin discloses a system for time-scale modification of speech based on a nonlinear oscillator model. Specifically, Kubin describes the oscillator model (page 453, col. 1, section 1.2), a state-transition codebook (page 453, col. 1, section 1.3) and application of the oscillator and codebook in time-scale modification (page 455, col.1, section 3). Kubin teaches that the system provides for high quality output at moderate computational cost.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to implement the time scale modification with oscillator model and state codebook techniques of Kubin in the timing recovery system of Shlomot, for the purpose of improving the speech quality of the transmitted speech at a moderate computational cost.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed March 23, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

7. Applicant argues Shepard cannot be relied upon to teach an expanded portion that is of a different size than the frame. The Examiner disagrees and argues that Shepard teaches inserting replicated data by a single period or possibly 10 periods (col. 4, lines 25-52), which would necessarily require the expanded portion to be of a different size than a frame of the signal.

Applicant argues Shlomot does not contemplate permanent packet loss in the received signal. Applicant further argues that Applicant believes "Shlomot means to say a drained buffer or an underflow condition when using the term missing speech packets." The Examiner

Art Unit: 2654

disagrees and argues the teachings of Shlomot specifically provide for compensating for packet loss at the decoder, wherein the loss of packets may or may not be deliberate, or whether the buffer result in a "drained or underflow condition" (col. 9, lines 24-26).

Applicant argues Shlomot, Shepard, and Kubin use fixed sized segments, but in none of the references is the segment size data dependent. The Examiner disagrees and argues Shlomot specifically teaches implementation of segments with a range of 120-240 samples (col. 6, line 44). Additionally, Shepard implements the system for an audio stream (music, speech, etc.), which would necessarily require a different segment size for speech than the segment for music or another form of audio.

Applicant argues none of the cited references contemplate multiple frames in deciding when to compress or expand. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., consideration of multiple frames in deciding when to compress or expand) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angela A. Armstrong whose telephone number is 703-308-6258. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (703) 305-9645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Angela A. Armstrong
Examiner
Art Unit 2654

AAA
May 27, 2004



RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER